

independent inventions. That same section points out that independent means that there is no disclosed relationship between the subjects disclosed.

The Examiner has not made any requirement based on the subject matter being independent. Therefore it is understood that the Examiner concedes that the subject matter is not independent.

The Examiner's requirement for restriction is based upon his holding that the subjects are distinct. That is, as pointed out in Section 802.01, the Examiner has held that the subject matter as claimed:

are capable of separate manufacture, use or sale as claimed, AND ARE PATENTABLE (novel and unobvious) OVER EACH OTHER.

The Examiner has held under Section 803 that the claimed inventions:

are able to support separate patents and they are ... distinct (MPEP Section 806.05-806.05(i)).

The Examiner argues that "The inventions listed as Groups I and II do not relate to a single general inventive concept... because, ... they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: claim 1 or 27 is anticipated or obvious over Steele US 5,952,542; Balazs US 5,911,868; and/or steward US 5,756,874. Consequently, the special technical feature which links Groups I-IV does not provide a contribution over the prior art, so unity of invention is lacking." However, none of these references relate to inorganic compounds as the present Application does, and therefore none of them are applicable. Furthermore, these references have previously been overcome in related applications including U.S. Patent Nos. 6,402,932 and 7,387,719. Also, the Groups are related as a process and apparatus used in the

practice of the process. Restriction is therefore improper.

In addition, Section 803 unequivocally states:

If the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the Examiner must examine it on the merits, even though it includes claims to distinct or independent inventions.

So that Section 803 makes its point clearly, the serious burden requirement is repeated under the title:

CRITERIA FOR RESTRICTION BETWEEN  
PATENTABLY DISTINCT INVENTIONS

Section 803 goes on to state that there are two criteria for a restriction requirement: one, that the inventions must be distinct as claimed; and two, that there must be a serious burden on the Examiner if restriction were not required.

Section 803 goes on to state under GUIDELINES that an Examiner must provide reasons and/or examples to support conclusions. The Examiner has not given reasons to support the conclusion that there would be a serious burden on the Examiner if restriction were not required.

The Examiner has not even argued that there would be a serious burden on the Examiner if restriction were not required. Indeed, there should be no serious burden on the Examiner.

The Examiner has not contended that the groups would be in different subclasses or specified subclasses in which he believes the groups would be classified. Applicant believes the groups would all be classified identically. It would not be unreasonable for the Examiner to search a single subclass for all groups. Similarly, the Examiner has given no reasons why prior

art applicable to one group would not likely be applicable to another group or why the groups would raise different non-prior art issues. Indeed, Applicant believes there are no such reasons. Therefore restriction should not be required.

Reconsideration and allowance of the application are requested. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the restriction requirement are requested.

Respectfully,



James C. Wray, Reg. No. 22,693  
Clifford D. Hyra, Reg. No. 60,086  
1493 Chain Bridge Road  
Suite 300  
McLean, Virginia 22101  
Tel: (703) 442-4800  
Fax: (703) 448-7397

Date: July 21, 2008